



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,115	02/01/2001	Johnny B. Corvin	UV-179	8786
1473	7590	07/13/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP ROPE & GRAY LLP 1211 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036-8704			SHEPARD, JUSTIN E	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/775,115	CORVIN, JOHNNY B.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Justin E. Shepard	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 14-16,40-48 and 69-80 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 14-16,40-48 and 69-80 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/22/07 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 14, 16 and 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Mori in view of Aoyama.

Referring to claim 14, Zigmond discloses a method of presenting a forced advertisement to a television viewer, the method comprising:

detecting the forced advertisement in an incoming video stream;  
presenting the forced advertisement on user equipment (column 7, lines 2-32).

Zigmond does not disclose a method with the step of turning off the user equipment while the forced advertisement is being displayed; and automatically presenting the forced advertisement, when the user equipment is turned on, from the beginning of the forced advertisement.

In an analogous art, Mori teaches a method with the step of turning off the user equipment while the forced advertisement is being displayed; and automatically presenting the forced advertisement, when the user equipment is turned on (Abstract: Solution; Note: as the ads disclosed by Zigmond are downloaded onto the STB (figure 6, part 106), the device taught by Mori is considered to be analogous art as it deals with resuming playback of data from a storage medium after a power failure).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the resuming after a power loss taught by Mori to the system disclosed by Zigmond. The motivation would have been to enable the device to present an entire program even after a power loss had occurred, therefore allowing the broadcaster to guarantee that an ad would be played on the STB regardless of the user's actions.

Zigmond and More do not disclose a method wherein the ad is played from the beginning of the forced advertisement.

In an analogous art, Aoyama teaches a method wherein the ad is played from the beginning of the forced advertisement (Abstract: Solution).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the replay from the beginning method taught by Aoyama to the method disclosed by Zigmond and Mori. The motivation would have been that playing an advertisement in its entirety would allow for better viewer retention over showing only the last few seconds.

Claims 40, 43, and 46 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 14.

Referring to claim 16, Zigmond discloses a method of claim 14, wherein the forced advertisement is stored in the user equipment (figure 6, part 106).

Claims 42, 45, and 48 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 16.

2. Claims 15, 41, 44, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Mori in view of Aoyama as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Hite.

Referring to claim 14, Zigmond, Mori and Aoyama do not disclose a method of claim 14, further comprising preventing the television viewer from changing channels while the forced advertisement is being presented.

In an analogous art, Hite teaches a method of claim 14, further comprising preventing the television viewer from changing channels while the forced advertisement is being presented (column 11, lines 58-60).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the channel changing suppression taught by Hite to the method disclosed

by Zigmond, Mori and Aoyama. The motivation would have been to stop aggressive channel surfers from avoiding the commercials (Zigmond: column 13, lines 16-39).

Claims 41, 44, and 47 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 15.

3. Claims 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Russo in view of Mori.

Referring to claim 69, Zigmond discloses a method of presenting a forced advertisement, the method comprising: detecting the forced advertisement in an incoming video stream; presenting the forced advertisement on user equipment (column 7, lines 2-32).

Zigmond does not disclose a method with the steps of turning off the user equipment while the forced advertisement is being displayed; and automatically presenting the forced advertisement, when the user equipment is turned on, from the point at which the user equipment was turned off.

In an analogous art, Russo teaches a method with the steps of interrupting the user equipment while the forced advertisement is being displayed; and automatically presenting the forced advertisement, when the user equipment is uninterrupted, from the point at which the user equipment was interrupted (column 5, lines 14-19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the video resuming taught by Russo in the system disclosed by Zigmond. The motivation would have been to allow the user to have the ability to watch a program or commercial from the point when their watching was interrupted from a network

outage, thereby allowing for the advertiser to be assured that their advertisement was aired.

Zigmond and Russo do not disclose a system where the interruption is caused by a power loss.

Mori discloses a system where the interruption is caused by a power loss  
(Abstract: Solution).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the resuming after a power loss taught by Mori to the system disclosed by Zigmond. The motivation would have been to enable the device to present an entire program even after a power loss had occurred, therefore allowing the broadcaster to guarantee that an ad would be played on the STB regardless of the user's actions.

Claims 72, 75, and 78 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 69.

Claims 71, 74, 77, and 80 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 16.

4. Claims 70, 73, 76, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Russo in view of Mori as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Hite.

Referring to claim 70, Zigmond, Russo and Mori do not disclose a method of claim 69, further comprising preventing the television viewer from changing channels while the forced advertisement is being presented.

In an analogous art, Hite teaches a method of claim 69, further comprising preventing the television viewer from changing channels while the forced advertisement is being presented (column 11, lines 58-60).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the channel changing suppression taught by Hite to the method disclosed by Zigmond, Mori and Aoyama. The motivation would have been to stop aggressive channel surfers from avoiding the commercials (Zigmond: column 13, lines 16-39).

Claims 73, 76, and 79 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 70.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS



CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600